

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

William Maciorowski;)	C.A. No. 0:08-2117-TLW-PJG
)	
Petitioner;)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
State of South Carolina; Warden of Coastal)	
Pre-Release Center;)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

The Petitioner, proceeding *pro se*, brings this action seeking habeas relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. At the time he filed this action, Petitioner was confined at the Coastal Pre-Release Center in North Charleston, SC.

On October 17, 2008, the Respondent moved for summary judgment on Petitioner's claims. On January 21, 2009, Petitioner filed a letter, which the Court liberally construes as a summary judgment response. On July 20, 2009, United States Magistrate Judge Paige Gossett, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), filed a Report and Recommendation ("the Report"). In her Report, Magistrate Judge Gossett recommends that the Respondent's motion for summary judgment be granted. Petitioner did not file objections to the Magistrate's Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of

objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and has concluded that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 43); and Respondent's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. # 25).¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

August 17, 2009
Florence, South Carolina

¹Petitioner also attached a Section 1983 complaint to his habeas corpus petition. However, the complaint contained no factual allegations. The Court does not believe Petitioner intended to pursue a Section 1983 action. However, to the extent Petitioner did intend to pursue such action, the complaint is clearly deficient and is also dismissed.